

Case 2:10-cv-00070-JPJ-PMS Document 24 Filed 02/09/12 Page 1 of 3 Pageid#: 783

weight to the opinions of her treating physicians. On this issue, I adopt the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge.

The plaintiff also argues that the ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence because although the ALJ found her asthma to be a severe impairment, he did not include any restriction for environmental irritants in her residual functional capacity ("RFC"). The magistrate judge did not specifically address this argument in her Report. In his decision, the ALJ noted that he was not including any environmental restrictions in the plaintiff's RFC for four reasons. First, the state agency physicians concluded that no environmental restrictions were necessary. Second, the plaintiff's medical records indicated that her asthma was stable. Also, the plaintiff had a history of smoking a pack of cigarettes per day until February 2009 and that habit apparently did not affect her asthma. And finally, June 2009 X rays showed that her lungs were clear. This substantial evidence supports the ALJ's conclusion that environmental restrictions were not necessary in the RFC.

For the foregoing reasons, the magistrate judge's Report and its findings and recommendations will be wholly accepted and approved, the plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment will be denied, and the defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment will be granted. A final judgment will be entered affirming the Commissioner's final decision denying benefits.

DATED: February 9, 2012

/s/ James P. Jones

United States District Judge